REMARKS

Claims 4 and 7 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 8, 16, and 17 have been amended to clarify the subject matter regarded as the invention. Claims 18 and 19 are new. Claims 1-3, 5-6, and 8-19 are pending.

The Examiner has objected to the amendment filed 12 July 2004 under 35 USC 132. Claim 1 has been amended to recite an analysis engine "executed on" a processor. As such, the applicant believes the amendment complies with 35 USC 132.

The specification has been amended to correct the application number incorporated by reference. No claim to priority has been made to application no. 09/615,967.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3 and 5-15 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph. Claim 1 has been amended to recite an analysis engine "executed on" a processor. Claims 2-3 and 5-15 depend from claim 1. As such, claims 1-3 and 5-15 are believed to comply with 35 USC 112, first paragraph.

The Examiner has rejected claim 16 under 35 USC 101. Claim 16 has been amended to recite a method "implemented on a computer." As such, claim 16 is believed to comply with 35 USC 101.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3, 5, 6, and 8-17 under 35 USC 102(a) as being anticipated by Thuraisingham et al. The examiner has rejected claim 7 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thuraisingham et al. and further in view of Tanenbaum. Thuraisingham discloses a tool for assisting an operator to detect security violation in a multilevel secure database. Tanenbaum teaches sleep and wakeup processes. Neither Thuraisingham nor Tanenbaum teaches an analysis engine, "wherein the analysis engine is further configured to use continuations to schedule the processing of a goal based at least in part on whether the data required to continue processing the goal is available and based at least in part on a subdivision of rules into segments which each become a rule" as amended in claim 1. Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate additional limitations of claim 7 as well as "a subdivision of rules into segments which each become a rule" disclosed in the specification without limitation at lines 11-12, page 90. As such, claim 1 is believed to be allowable.

Claims 2-3, 5, 6, 8-15 depend from claim 1 and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Claim 7 has been canceled.

Claim 8 has been amended to depend from claim 5, which depends from claim 1.

Claims 16 and 17 have been amended similarly to claim 1 and are believed to allowable for the same reasons described above.

New claims 18 and 19 depend from claim 1 and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above. Support for claim 18 and 19 can be found in the specification without limitation at line 11 on page 90 through line 2 on page 91.

Reconsideration of the application and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested based on the preceding remarks. If at any time the Examiner believes that an interview would be helpful, please contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 3/14/05

William J. James
Registration No. 40,661
V 408-973-2592
F 408-973-2595

VAN PELT, YI & JAMES LLP
10050 N. Foothill Blvd., Suite 200
Cupertino, CA 95014